

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

No claims are currently cancelled.

Claims 1 and 5 are currently being amended.

No claims are currently being added.

This amendment and reply amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-20 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 5, 9-11, 15, 16 and 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0033431 to Shinomiya in view of JP 200115197A to Sai; claims 3, 7, 14 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shinomiya in view of Sai and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0221127 to Ang; and claims 4, 8, 12, 13 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shinomiya in view of Sai and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,497,480 to Hayes. These rejections are traversed for at least the reasons given below.

In its rejection of independent claims 1 and 5, the Office Action appears to rely on Sai for teaching that a communication command includes a destination computer number, a destination process number, a destination logical address, a transfer length, a sending source computer number, a sending source process number, and a sending source logical address. However, the Abstract of Sai merely describes that a source process name, a source process address, a destination station, a destination process address, and an identification code are stored in stations 100 and 200. The Abstract of Sai does not teach or suggest that a transfer

length is also stored in the stations 100 and 200. To make this distinction even more explicit, independent claims 1 and 5 have been amended to recite that the transfer length is representative of a length of data to be transferred.

Accordingly, since Sai does not teach or suggest that a transfer length is included in a communication command, and since Shinomiya does not rectify this deficiency of Sai, presently pending independent claims 1 and 5 are patentable over the cited art of record.

With respect to independent claims 15 and 19, those claims recite that the “processor does not carry out any address conversion but instead sends out the communication command and a logical address to said communication device.” This claim element was not addressed in the Office Action, and therefore the rejection of claim 15 and 19 is improper for this reason.

Furthermore, even if this claim element was properly addressed, Applicant submits that the rejection would be improper since none of the references teaches or suggests a processor that does not carry out any address conversion and, instead, issues out communication commands and logical addresses to a communication device.

Accordingly, independent claims 15 and 19 are patentable over the cited art of record.

With respect to the rejection of dependent claims 3, 7, 14 and 17, the Office Action incorrectly asserts that paragraph [0064] of Ang teaches the features recited in these claims. Rather, paragraph [0064] of Ang describes a pipeline system that contains conflict detection hardware to ensure a minimum gap between an instruction I_j and any conflicting instruction, whereby such features having nothing at all to do with limiting the number of communication commands to be processed simultaneously to a same destination computer from a sending computer, in order to increase a hit ratio of a translation lookaside buffer.

Therefore, dependent claims 3, 7, 14 and 17 patentable distinguish over the cited art of record for these additional reasons.

With respect to the rejection of dependent claims 12 and 13, the Office Action incorrectly asserts that column 2, lines 27 et seq. of Hayes teaches the features recited in those claims. Rather, column 2, lines 27 et seq. of Hayes describes a method and apparatus for removing a page table entry from TLBs, whereby a request packet to remove a page table

entry is issued by a first TLB, and that request packet is received by a second TLB in which a predetermined source is specified in the request packet. If the second TLB contains the page table entry to be removed, the removal of the page table entry is performed, and a reply packet is sent to the first TLB to notify it of the removal. This description in Hayes does not teach or suggest that a command is sent to includes a maximum simultaneous process number, whereby when that number is two or more, a command identification number indicative of an identification number of a command to be processed simultaneously is added to each of communication packets to designate a TLB entry to be used as a reception source. In other words, the description of a process to remove a page table entry in a TLB based on a request made by another TLB, is not related to the specific features recited in dependent claims 12 and 13.

Accordingly, dependent claims 12 and 13 patentably distinguish over the cited art of record for these additional reasons.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing or a credit card payment form being unsigned, providing incorrect information resulting in a rejected credit card transaction, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date November 19, 2009

By Phillip J. Articola

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6014
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

George C. Beck
Registration No. 38,072

Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819